

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/700,376	KAASILA ET AL.	
	Examiner Antonio A. Caschera	Art Unit 2628	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Antonio A. Caschera. (3) _____.

(2) Ed Porter. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 14 June 2007.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: Independent.

Identification of prior art discussed: N/A.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's Representative inquired on the finality of the office action mailed 04/26/07. In particular, Applicant's Representative questioned the 35 USC 112 rejection of the claims and noted that the amendment solely placed allowable subject matter from claim 4, and any intervening claims, into independent form. Therefore, the 35 USC 112 rejection, which found issues pertaining to the language from claim 4, is a new grounds of rejection that was not necessitated by the amendment since the language was previously found in claim 4. Examiner agreed and indicated that a withdrawal of finality of the office action would be made and a new non-final office action would be sent .